DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 316 RC 011 828

AUTHOR Carter, Keith A.: Beaulieu, Lionel J.
TITLE Consequences of Migration for the Socioeconomic Structure and Institutional Structure of Communities.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 39p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociology Section of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists (Hot Springs, AR, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Change: Community Leaders: Community Problems: *Community Size: Demography: *Institutions: *Migrants: Migration Patterns: Needs Assessment: *Resource Allocations: Rural Areas: *Socioeconomic Status: Urban Areas
IDENTIFIERS Florida

ABSTRACT

Although the institutional structure of destination communities may remain unchanged by migration, the socioeconomic structure may be directly affected. Data from a statewide survey in Florida indicate that interstate migrants (who have lived in Florida less than 5 years), intrastate migrants (who have lived in Florida more than 5 years but in the same community less than 5 years), and nonmigrants have similar priorities regarding community needs, regardless of the size of the destination community (less than 2,500: 2,500 to 50,000: or more than 50,00 population). However, the different types of migrants have different concepts of what constitutes serious community problems and where financial resources should be spent. When the individuals in various community roles change due to migration, the community's socioeconomic structure may also change. This may alter the manner in which community needs are addressed. The greater the difference between migrants and nonmigrants, the greater the impact of migration on the destination community. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183316

Consequences of Migration for the Socioeconomic Structure and Institutional Structure of Communities

By

Keith A. Carter
Lionel J. Beaulieu
Center for Community and Rural Development
Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

A paper presented at the 1980 annual meeting of the Rural Sociology section of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists in Hot Springs, Arkansas.

RC 011828

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Keith A. Carter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Consequences of Migration for the Socioeconomic Structure and Institutional Structure of Communities

by

Keith A. Carter
Lionel J. Beaulieu
Center for Community and Rural Development
Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences
University of Florida

ABSTRACT

Over the past four decades in the United States, the study of migration and its impacts on communities has been a major research challenge for social scientists. During the 1940s and 1950s, researchers focused upon the rural-to-urban migration phenomenon. During the 1960s and 1970s, this migration trend slowed and reversed to attract a great deal of research on the urban-to-rural migration phenomenon. The migration process is selective of individuals possessing differential attributes and resources. As such, migration can have major consequences for the socioeconomic and institutional structures of communities. The focus of this article is upon the socioeconomic characteristics and community evaluations of migrants and nonmigrants in rural and urban areas. The data were drawn from a statewide survey in Florida. Respondents are differentiated on the basis of migration status (interstate migrant, intrastate migrant, and nonmigrant) and migration destination (rural, communities 2,500 to 50,000 in population, and communities over 50,000 in population).

Consequences of Migration for the Socioeconomic Structure and Institutional Structure of Communities

Throughout most of United States history, two major dimensions of population distribution have been the increasing concentration of people in large cities and the westward migration of people across the continent. The westward expansion, may have been in part a reaction to the increasing concentration of population in Eastern cities. The study of migration and its impacts on communities has been a major research challenge for social scientists.

Over the past four decades in the United States, social scientists have studied these two major dimensions of population distribution in terms of the rural-to-urban migration stream and the more recent urban-to-rural migration stream. During the late 1940s a rapid rural-to-urban migration trend began, continued through the 1950s and peaked and halted near 1965 (Beale and Fuguitt, 1978:158). Since 1970, changes in rural and urban population flows have occurred to the extent that rural areas are growing and growing at a faster rate than urban areas (Beale and Fuguitt, 1978:158).

In view of these migration streams, Schwarzweller focused his presidential address to the Rural Sociological Society on challenging rural sociologists to develop greater understanding of the sociocultural impacts of these migration streams on U.S. communities (1979:7). He proposed that the sociology of migration is particularly immature regarding the paucity of information on urban-to-rural migration and its associated impacts. Research must focus upon the relationships between the extent of net migration, the selectivity of migration, and the impact of these changes on existing struc-

tural circumstances of our communities. Schwarzweller (1979:15) listed the major migration research questions as:

(1) WHO are the migrants? (the study of migration selectivity)

(2) WHY did they migrate? (the study of perceived relative deprivations)

(3) WHERE did they migrate? (the study of relocation destinations)

(4) WHAT are the consequences of migration? (the study of community social reorganization and/or adjustments of migrants)

The emphasis of this analysis was focused upon the last two research questions. The data for this analysis were drawn from a statewide needs assessment survey of Florida residents. Florida is a particularly suitable state for the study of migration. Between 1960 and 1970, the population of Florida increased by 1,837,883 resulting in a 37 percent increase in population (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1971). In-migration contributed 72 percent (1,331,093 persons) of this increase (Bowles et al., 1975). It has been estimated that between 1970 and 1977, Florida's population increased by 1,925,916 or a 28 percent increase in population. Ninety percent (1,742,957 persons) of this population increase for 1970-77 has been attributed to in-migration (Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Florida, 1978).

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The three demographic processes affecting population size, composition, and distribution are fertility, mortality, and migration. Of the three processes, migration is the most significant, both statistically and sociologically. Statistically, in the United States migration has been the largest component of change in population size, composition, and distribution. It has already

been shown that 90 percent of Florida's population growth between 1970 and 1977 was due to migration.

Migration is an important demographic process from a sociological perspective in that those who move are significantly different from those who do not more; i.e., migration is selective and migrants are not a representative sample of the population of origin or the population of destination (Goldscheider, 1971:299). Migration is a sociological process, as well as a demographic process, since the social structural systems of both places of origin and places of destination are affected by migration (Bogue, 1969:752; Jansen , 1969:60; Kammeyer, 1971:69; and Schwarzweller, 1979:69). Schwarzweller describes migration as an interchange of elements of social organization and a process through which community systems are joined (1979:16). Migrants, as individuals, are thus viewed as unit carriers of a particular kind of social organization bringing with them certain needs, resources, and perspectives on the community. Few institutional systems of a community are unaffected by population growth through migration. Within communities major institutional systems such as education, transportation, and health have been developed to meet basic human needs. Through various collective mechanisms, assessment of community needs have been made and community resources in terms of financial resources, personnel, and facilities were allocated to provide services to meet these needs. However, a great influx of new community residents may result in demands for more or different services. Changes in police and fire protection, educational services, health services, improved transportation, and other changes in institutional structure may be demanded by new residents. Thus, in-migration may create problems for social

integration and community solidarity by creating conflicts over goals and the allocation of community resources.

However, population growth through migration will not automatically result in a more heterogeneous population or a re-ordering of institutional goals. The degree to which migration impacts the socioeconomic structure and institutional structure of communities remains a research problem for communities experiencing heavy in-migration. The greater the differences between migrants and nonmigrants, the greater the impact of migration on the community.

MEASUREMENT AND DATA

The data for this analysis were drawn from a statewide needs assessment survey entitled "Focus on Florida: The Citizens' Viewpoint." The purpose of the survey was to ascertain what Floridians considered priority concerns for local governments. The survey focused upon citizen's perceptions of community problems, needs, and issues, and upon their priorities in the expenditure of public monies to alleviate these problems. Data collection was conducted during the Spring of 1978.

A sample of 9,800 names representative of all adults in Florida was selected from a statewide list of licensed drivers. Response rate for the survey was 69.8 percent. The sample was stratified by age and sex, and rural areas were over sampled to ensure response from all 67 counties in Florida.

Migration status

Any migration study must distinguish between movers and migrants. Bogue

does this by beginning with the concept of residential mobility; i.e., residential mobility is any change of permanent residence that involves movement from one structure to another (Bogue, 1969:752). Two classes of residential mobility are (1) local movement: a change of residence within the same community, city, or county; and (2) migration: a change of residence involving movement between communities, cities, or counties. Thus, migration has been defined as the movement of individuals or groups from one community to another with the intention of remaining in the new community for some substantial period of time and a migrant has been defined as any person who changes his/her regular community of residence (Kammeyer, 1971:54).

The U.S. census has provided a convenient and frequently used method for measuring migration. The U.S. census determines for persons over 5 years of age where they were living 5 years prior to the time of enumeration. From this question, four categories of mobility are possible:

(1) those living in the same house as they were 5 years earlier;

(2) those living in a different house, but in the same county (movers);

(3) those living in different county, but the same state (intrastate migrants); and,

(4) those living in a different state(interstate migrants) (Kammeyer, 1971:56).

As a result of these categories in the U.S. census, it has become customary to define migration as intercounty mobility, and thus, individuals must cross county lines to be considered a migrant. However, this analysis focused upon intercommunity migration rather than intercounty migration.

Migration status of respondents was determined by two questions: (1) "How many years have you lived in your present community?" and (2) How many years

have you lived in Florida?" Using the information from these two questions, interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants, were operationally defined as:

(1) interstate migrants: respondents who have lived in their present community and in the state of Florida 5 years or less;

(2) intrastate migrants: respondents who have lived in their present community 5 years or less, but who have lived in the state of Florida more than 5 years; and

(3) nonmigrants: respondents who have lived in the present community and in the state of Florida for more than 5 years.

Using these operational definitions, 16.2 percent of the sample (n=956) were interstate migrants, 17.1 percent of the sample (n=1008) were intrastate migrants, and 66.8 percent of the sample (n=3,943) were nonmigrants.

Community Size

Community preference studies have shown that preferences for rural or urban communities are derived from emphasis upon different qualitative factors of each community size. Thus, individuals who prefer rural and small communities place greater priority upon factors such as air and water quality, lower crime rates, and friendliness of residents; while individuals who prefer urban communities place greater priority upon factors such as educational and occupational opportunities (Christenson, 1979:331). It might, therefore, be assumed that migrants to rural and urban communities differ significantly in terms of socioeconomic background and perceptions of community problems.

A control on community size, therefore, was placed in the analysis. The sample was split into the following three groups according to community size:

(1) respondents living in rural areas (farm, rural nonfarm, and communities less than 2,500 population);

(2) respondents living in communities with populations of 2,500 to 50,000; and,

(3) respondents living in communities with populations over 50,000.

Using these community sizes, 26.0 percent of the sample (n=1,442) in rural areas, 38.2 percent of the sample (n=2,122) resided in communities with populations of 2,500 to 50,000, and 35.8 percent of the sample (n=1,991) resided in communities with populations over 50,000.

Impact of Migration on the Socioeconomic Structure of Communities

As discussed earlier, a major demographic generalization is that the migration process is selective of individuals possessing differential attributes and resources. The impact that migration selectivity has on the socioeconomic structure of communities was analyzed by comparing the socioeconomic characteristics of interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants. The distributions of variables selected for comparison were:

(1) age
(2) sex
(3) race
(4) marital status
(5) education
(6) employment status
(7) occupation of household head
(8) income
(9) number of children under 18
(10) ownership of residence
(11) voter registration and participation

The greater the differences between migrants and nonmigrants on these variables, the greater the impact of migration on the socioeconomic structure of the communities.

Impact of Migration on the Institutional Structure of Communities

The potential for having significant impact on the institutional structure of communities derives from the degree of divergence between the perceptions of migrants and nonmigrants regarding community problems and their priorities for the expenditure of public funds. The questionnaire contained a series of 46 problem items and the respondents were asked to indicate whether each item was NOT a problem, a SMALL problem, a MEDIUM problem, or a SERIOUS problem in their community. Ranking of the perceived severity of community problems was obtained by combining the medium and serious categories. Rather than presenting data on all 46 items, the ten problems which were evaluated as medium or serious by the largest percentages of respondents were selected. The severity of these ten problems were then ranked according to the percentage of respondents evaluating each item as a serious or medium problem for their community.

In addition to evaluating of community problems, respondents were presented with a series of 37 items relating to problems and needs to which the respondent indicated whether he would spend LESS, the SAME amount, or MORE tax dollars than are presently being spent on that problem. The ten problems to which the largest percentages of respondents indicated they would spend MORE were selected for analysis. These ten problems were then ranked for interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants.

The degree of correlation among the rankings of interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants was then evaluated through Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance. The less the correlation among rankings, the greater the potential impact of migration upon the institutional structure of

of communities. If migrants and nonmigrants are in agreement on the ranking of community problems and the priority of expenditures of public funds, then migrants will force few changes in the institutional structure of the community.

FINDINGS

Table 1 contains information on the residential location of interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants. This information addresses the question of "Where did they migrate?" and thus, tells us the community of destination. There were significant differences between interstate migrants and intrastate migrants regarding migration destination. Intrastate migrants were much more likely to migrate to rural areas. Thirty percent of the intrastate migrants were located in rural areas, but only 19 percent of the interstate migrants were located in rural areas. The nonmigrants in the sample were nearly evenly divided among rural areas, communities with populations between 2,500 and 50,000 and communities with populations over 50,000.

Table 1 about here

Consequences of Migration to Rural Areas

Tables 2,3, and 4 contain the information on socioeconomic characteristics, ranking of the severity of problems, and ranking of problems where more tax dollars should be spent in rural areas. The information in Table 2 illustrates that there are several significant differences between migrants and nonmigrants in rural areas. The socioeconomic characteristics on which

all three groups are nearly identical are sex, marital status, and income. The difference among the three groups in terms of racial composition is statistically significant at the .05 level, but substantively the difference is negligible. Over 90 percent of all three groups were white. It must be noted that the sample size is large enough to make small differences statistically significant. Both groups of migrants tended to be better educated, less likely to own their residence, less likely to be registered to vote and less likely to have voted in the 1976 presidential election than nonmigrants. On some variables, interstate migrants were considerably different from intrastate migrants. Interstate migrants were more likely to be over 65, retired, not in the labor force, and to have no children under 18 than were intrastate migrants.

Table 2 about here

Table 3 contains the rankings of community problems by interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants in rural areas. An examination of the rankings shows that the three groups of respondents have nearly identical rankings of community problems. Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance is 0.911. The only problem that migrants appear to evaluate as more severe than nonmigrants is the availability of low cost housing. Cost of housing ranked third among the migrants, but was only sixth among nonmigrants. Recall that nonmigrants were more likely to own their own homes.

Table 3 about here

Table 4 pertains to the problems where respondents would spend more tax dollars. Again the rankings among the three groups of respondents are nearly identical. Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance is 0.841.

Table 4 about here

Thus, for rural areas migration has impacted the socioeconomic structure of the communities; but based on the rankings of community problems and spending priorities, migration has little potential for impacting the institutional structure of the communities.

Consequences of Migration for Communities of Population 2,500 to 50,000

Tables 5,6, and 7 contain the information on socioeconomic characteristics, ranking of the severity of problems, and ranking of problems where more tax dollars should be spent in communities of populations 2,500 to 50,000. As with the rural areas, there are several significant differences between migrants and nonmigrants in communities of this population. The socioeconomic characteristics on which all three groups are nearly identical are sex, marital status, income, and number of children under 18. Both groups of migrants tended to be better educated, were less likely to own their residences, were less likely to be registered to vote, and were less likely to have voted in the last presidential election than nonmigrants. On some variables interstate migrants were considerably different than intrastate migrants. Interstate migrants tended to be older, were more likely to be white, were more likely to be retired, and were more likely to not be

in the labor force.

Table 5 about here

Table 6 contains the rankings of community problems among respondents in communities of 2,500 to 50,000 population. Again, as with rural areas, the rankings among the three groups of respondents are nearly identical. Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance is 0.882.

Table 6 about here

Table 7 pertains to the problems where respondents would spend more tax dollars. Although somewhat less similar than previous sets of rankings, there is still a great deal of similarity in the priority of expenditures of the three groups. Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance is 0.750. The major discrepancies in the rankings occur between interstate migrants and intrastate migrants rather than between migrants and nonmigrants. For example, interstate migrants rank attracting and developing industy as second in priority while intrastate migrants ranked this item ninth.

Table 7 about here

Thus, for communities with populations between 2,500 and 50,000, there are differences in the socioeconomic characteristics of migrants and non-migrants, but again the severity of community problems and spending priorities are viewed very similarly for all three groups.

Consequences of Migration for Communities with Populations over 50,000

Tables 8, 9, and 10 contain the information on socioeconomic characteristics,

ranking of the severity of problems, and ranking of problems where more tax dollars should be spent in metropolitan communities. The findings in these three tables are very similar to the findings regarding rural areas and communities with populations between 2,500 and 50,000. Table 8 illustrates that there are several significant differences in the socioeconomic characteristics of migrants and nonmigrants. The variables on which all three groups are nearly identical are sex, income, and number of children under 18. Both groups of migrants tended to be better educated, were less likely to own their own homes, were less likely to be registered to vote, and were less likely to have voted in the last presidential election than nonmigrants. Comparing interstate with intrastate migrants, the data indicate that interstate migrants tended to be older, were more likely to be white, were more likely to be married, were more likely to be retired, and were more likely to not be in the labor force.

Table 8 about here

Table 9 again shows that the rankings of community problems are nearly identical for interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants. Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance is 0.956.

Table 9 about here

Table 10 pertains to the problems where respondents would spend more tax dollars in communities over 50,000. As with the other sets of rankings, the spending priorities based on these data would be nearly identical for

interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants. Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance is 0.779. The only items with large differences in priorities are vocational training in high school and attracting and developing industry. Interstate migrants would put vocational training programs at the bottom of the spending priorities, but intrastate migrants and nonmigrants would place this item near the middle of the priorities list. Also, interstate migrants place attracting and developing industry fourth in priority, but intrastate migrants and nonmigrants would place this item near the bottom of the priority list.

Table 10 about here

Thus, the findings for residents of communities with populations over 50,000 are nearly identical to the previous two analyses. Migration to metropolitan communities may have substantial impact on the socioeconomic structure of these communities. However, the rankings of severity of community problems and spending priorities indicate that there would be little impact on the institutional structure of these communities.

CONCLUSIONS

The analyses of the rankings of community problems and spending priorities suggested that there were very few differences in the priorities of interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants regardless of the size of the community of destination. This finding is not to say that there were no differences in the responses to individual items of the questionnaire. In fact, an examination of the differing percentages of migrants and nonmigrants

evaluating each problem as NOT a problem, SMALL problem, a MEDIUM problem, or a SERIOUS problem found that there were very significant differences statistically in these responses.Also, statistically significant differences were found in evaluations by respondents of whether LESS, the SAME, or MORE tax dollars shoud be spent on a particluar program. However, most community decision making on the severity of problems and the amount of funds that should be spent alleviating the problems faced by community institutions are not made on an item by item basis. Instead these decisions are made from the perspective that local governments must allocate resources among a variety of institutions,and the more resouces allocated to some community institutions, the less resources there are to allocate to the other major institutions. Thus, the severity of problems and allocations of resources are ranked in some manner in decision making. Thus, the influx of migrants to a community may not have significant impacts on the overall institutional structure of a community. The relative priority of needs may stay the same.

However, the data analyzed here did suggest that migration may have significant impact on the socioeconomic structure of communities. Thus, even though the broad institutional structure of the community may not be greatly effected by migration, the individual actors in various community roles may be changed by a differing socioeconomic structure. For example, the need for a teenage drug abuse program may be high on the priority list whether or not a community is experiencing high in-migration. But the community actors leading the program and deciding the exact level of resource allocation may be quite different for communities with different socioeconomic structures. Thus, the relative priority of community needs may be similar, but the change in socioeconomic structure due to migration may alter the manner in which those community needs are addressed.

Stated differently, the basic institutions of communities may be viewed as social action systems. These institutional systems are social action systems that have developed over time to meet basic community needs. As social action systems, a chief characteristic of institutional systems is the more or less patterned forms of interaction that have developed among relevant groups, associations, and organizations. These relationships operate through the various statuses and attached roles in the constituent organizations. The actual role performances and changes in statuses and roles would be greatly related to the socioeconomic structure of the community and the changes in the structure. If migration has an impact on the socio-economic structure of the community, then over time this impact would cause adjustments in the institutional action system. Thus, migration may not have immediate and direct impact on the institutional structure of the community, but rather has indirect impact on that structure. The ranking of basic community needs and priority of fiscal expenditures may remain relatively stable in the short run, but the manner in which these problems are addressed through actors in various statuses may change over time as the socioeconomic structure changes. Such longitudinal changes are not detected through single needs assessment surveys, and remain a research challenge for rural sociologists.

REFERENCES

Beale, Calvin L., and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1978 "The new pattern of nonmetropolitan population change." Pp. 157-177 in Karl E. Taeuber, Larry L. Bumpass, and James A. Sweet (eds.), Social Demography. New York: Academic Press.

Bogue, Donald J.
1969 Principles of Demography. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Bowles, Gladys K., Calvin L. Beale, and Everett S. Lee
1975 Net Migration of the Population, 1960-70 By Age, Sex, and Color. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Printing Department.

Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Florida
1978 Florida Statistical Abstract '78. Gainesville, FL: The University Presses of Florida.

Christenson, James A.
1979 "Value orientations of potential migrants and nonmigrants." Rural Sociology 44(2): 331-344.

Goldscheider, Calvin
1971 Population, Modernization, and Social Structure. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Jansen, C.
1969 "Some sociological aspects of migration." Pp. 60-73 in J.A. Jackson (ed.), Migration. London: Cambridge University Press.

Kammeyer, Kenneth C.W.
1971 An Introduction to Population. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Schwarzweller, Harry K.
1979 "Migration and the changing rural scene." Rural Sociology 44(1):7-23.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census
1971 General Population Characteristics, 1970, PC(1)-B11, Florida. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Table 1. Residential location of interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants[a]

	Interstate migrants (n=956)	Intrastate migrants (n=1,008)	Nonmigrants (n=3,943)
		--percent--	
Rural (farm, nonfarm, community less than 2,500 population)	19.4	30.0	26.4
Community with population of 2,500-50,000	48.5	37.2	36.0
Community with population over 50,000	32.1	32.8	37.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

[a]Chi-square value statistically significant beyond the .001 level of significance

Table 2. Socioeconomic characteristics of interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants in rural areas

	Interstate migrants (n=174)	Intrastate migrants (n=285)	Nonmigrants (n=975)
		--percent--	
Age[a]			
18-24	10.6	12.0	9.2
25-44	34.1	47.9	32.9
45-64	32.4	27.1	34.6
65 and older	22.9	13.0	23.3
Sex			
Male	43.4	45.3	46.0
Female	56.6	54.7	54.0
Race[c]			
White	96.6	94.7	92.3
Black	1.7	3.5	6.5
Other	1.7	1.8	1.2
Marital Status			
Never married	9.9	7.4	7.6
Married	83.0	83.1	79.5
Separated or divorced	3.5	6.0	5.2
Widowed	3.5	3.5	7.7
Education[b]			
Less than 12th grade	16.2	18.7	27.8
High school graduate	28.9	33.1	32.6
Some college	39.3	29.2	24.9
College graduate	9.2	10.2	8.1
Graduate or professional school	6.4	8.8	6.5
Employment status[b]			
Employed fulltime	34.1	50.0	46.6
Employed parttime	3.5	6.7	8.8
Unemployed	2.3	4.6	3.5
Student	4.0	1.8	2.4
Homemaker	21.4	19.0	15.7
Retired	31.8	15.8	20.6
Disabled	2.9	4.6	3.5
Occupation of household head[a]			
Professional, technical and managerial	18.9	27.4	24.7
Sales, clerical, craftsmen	23.7	26.3	25.1
Operatives, transportation, laborers, service workers	16.0	18.9	18.5
Not in labor force	41.4	27.4	31.7

Table 2. (Cont.)

	Interstate migrants (n=174)	Intrastate migrants (n=285)	Nonmigrants (n=975)
		--percent--	
Income			
Under $9,000	40.5	33.1	36.8
$9,000-14,999	28.2	28.1	24.4
$15,000-19,999	11.7	16.3	16.1
$20,000 and over	19.6	22.4	22.7
Number of children under 18[b]			
0	65.9	47.3	60.7
1	12.1	18.0	13.4
2	13.9	22.6	13.2
3	5.2	5.3	7.7
4 or more	2.9	2.1	1.0
Residence[a]			
Own	68.4	76.6	83.7
Rent	18.1	13.1	6.3
Other	13.5	10.3	9.9
Presently registered to vote[a]	72.5	75.4	85.2
Voted in 1976 presidential election[a]	66.3	63.7	81.6

[a]Chi-square value statistically significant beyond .001 level of significance

[b]Chi-square value statistically significant beyond .01 level of significance

[c]Chi-square value statistically significant beyond .05 level of significance

Table 3. Ranking of severity of specific problems by interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants in rural areas

Problem issue	Interstate migrants (n=174) Rank	Interstate migrants (n=174) Percent medium or serious	Intrastate migrants (n=285) Rank	Intrastate migrants (n=285) Percent medium or serious	Nonmigrants (n-975) Rank	Nonmigrants (n-975) Percent medium or serious
Teenage drug abuse	2	67.8	1	73.8	2	74.1
Job opportunities for youth	1	73.0	2	72.1	1	76.2
Crime	6	55.2	8	52.8	5	59.5
Traffic congestion	8	51.0	10	37.3	9	40.8
Availability of low-cost housing	3	63.5	3	65.9	6	58.5
Upkeep of road and streets	5	56.8	4	65.7	3	66.2
Citizen participation in community decision making	9	49.4	6	57.1	8	52.7
Community growing too fast	10	42.7	9	41.3	10	40.1
Quality of junior high and high school programs	7	52.0	7	53.6	7	57.2
Safe paths for bike riders	4	61.5	5	63.6	4	59.6

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance: W=0.911
Chi-square value=24.6, d.f.=9
Statistically significant beyond .01 level

Table 4. Ranking of specific problem where more tax dollars should be spent by interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants in rural areas

Problem issue	Interstate migrants (n=174) Rank	Interstate migrants (n=174) Percent spend more	Intrastate migrants (n=285) Rank	Intrastate migrants (n=285) Percent spend more	Nonmigrants (n=975) Rank	Nonmigrants (n=975) Percent spend more
Nursing care in the homes of older people	2	53.8	1	58.2	1	60.8
Special education programs for retarded and handicapped citizens	5	46.4	4	52.5	4	47.7
Preserving natural scenic areas	8	40.6	5	47.1	9	39.1
Housing for poor people	9	40.2	9	38.4	8	42.4
Crime prevention and control	1	57.3	2	57.9	2	59.6
Vocational training programs in high school	10	38.0	7	43.9	6.5	45.8
Improving existing streets and roads	6	45.6	6	45.7	5	47.5
Housing for older people	4	47.6	3	53.8	3	52.2
Building bike paths	7	42.9	10	37.2	10	34.9
Attracting and developing industry	3	49.4	8	41.4	6.5	45.8

Kendall's Coefficient Concordance: W=0.841
Chi-square value=22.7, d.f.=9
Statistically significant beyond .01 level

Table 5. Socioeconomic characteristics of interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants in community of 2,500 to 50,000 population

	Interstate migrants (n=434)	Intrastate migrants (n=354)	Nonmigrants (n=1,328)
		--percent--	
Age[a]			
18-24	9.3	14.4	10.7
25-44	37.2	42.5	27.7
45-64	26.0	23.6	33.2
65 and older	27.4	19.5	28.4
Sex			
Male	48.0	47.0	43.3
Female	52.0	53.0	56.7
Race[a]			
White	93.3	88.0	90.0
Black	1.2	10.3	8.0
Other	5.5	1.7	2.0
Marital Status			
Never married	10.6	11.4	12.4
Married	80.1	73.3	72.1
Separated or divorced	4.8	9.9	6.5
Widowed	4.4	5.4	9.0
Education[a]			
Less than 12th grade	11.1	15.1	20.4
High school graduate	21.5	25.9	28.9
Some college	36.7	36.6	31.5
College graduate	15.7	13.1	9.6
Graduate or professional school	15.0	9.4	9.6
Employment status[b]			
Employed fulltime	37.1	53.4	42.3
Employed parttime	7.1	9.1	7.9
Unemployed	1.8	2.0	2.0
Student	3.5	2.8	3.9
Homemaker	17.1	10.5	15.4
Retired	31.3	19.6	25.7
Disabled	2.1	2.6	2.8
Occupation of household head[a]			
Professional, technical and managerial	28.4	29.0	26.4
Sales, clerical, craftsmen	21.3	30.8	23.4
Operatives, transportation, laborers, service workers	10.4	14.7	15.1
Not in labor force	40.0	25.5	35.1

Table 5. (Cont.)

	Interstate migrants (n=434)	Intrastate migrants (n=354)	Nonmigrants (n=1,328)
		--percent--	
Income			
Under $9,000	29.0	31.1	31.2
$9,000-14,999	29.2	22.5	24.9
$15,000-19,999	15.3	15.3	14.9
$20,000 and over	26.5	31.1	29.0
Number of children under 18			
0	65.4	55.3	66.2
1	14.3	18.7	14.6
2	12.6	15.9	11.6
3	5.1	7.2	4.4
4 or more	2.5	2.9	3.2
Residence[a]			
Own	69.8	66.5	78.4
Rent	19.1	24.7	10.1
Other	11.2	8.8	11.4
Presently registered to vote[a]	75.5	79.5	86.9
Voted in 1976 presidential election[a]	72.3	72.5	80.2

[a]Chi-square value statistically significant beyond .001 level of significance

[b]Chi-square value statistically significant beyond .01 level of significance

Table 6. Ranking of severity of specific problems by interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants in communities of 2,500 to 50,000 population

Problem issue	Interstate migrants (n=434)		Intrastate migrants (n=354)		Nonmigrants (n=1,328)	
	Rank	Percent medium or serious	Rank	Percent medium or serious	Rank	Percent medium or serious
Teenage drug abuse	3	70.0	2	72.8	1	76.9
Job opportunities for youth	2	71.4	1	74.3	2	72.5
Crime	6	57.3	8	56.7	4	65.0
Traffic congestion	1	72.3	3	65.5	3	65.7
Availability of low-cost housing	4	64.5	5	60.7	5	64.0
Upkeep of roads and streets	9	51.2	7	58.5	7	58.4
Citizen participation in community decision making	10	49.3	10	53.7	9	55.4
Community growing too fast	7	56.9	9	54.4	8	57.3
Quality of junior high and high school programs	8	55.0	6	59.0	10	54.3
Safe paths for bike riders	5	60.8	4	64.2	6	61.3

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance: W=0.882
Chi-square value=23.8, d.f.=9
Statistically significant beyond .01 level

Table 7. Ranking of specific problems where more tax dollars should be spent by interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants in communities of 2,500 to 50,000 population

Problem issue	Interstate migrants (n=434) Rank	Interstate migrants (n=434) Percent spend more	Intrastate migrants (n=354) Rank	Intrastate migrants (n=354) Percent spend more	Nonmigrants (n=1,328) Rank	Nonmigrants (n=1,328) Percent spend more
Nursing care in the homes of older people	3	51.6	2	58.6	1	62.1
Special education programs for retarded and handicapped citizens	4	48.8	4	51.4	4	49.7
Preserving natural scenic areas	5	46.6	7.5	44.5	6	47.1
Housing for poor people	10	40.3	10	42.0	8	44.6
Crime prevention	1	56.2	1	60.7	2	61.0
Vocational training programs in high school	7	46.1	7.5	44.5	9	43.5
Improving existing streets and roads	8	45.5	6	45.4	5	48.0
Housing for old people	6	46.3	3	53.2	3	51.0
Building bike paths	9	43.9	5	47.0	10	43.3
Attracting and developing industry	2	54.6	9	43.4	7	45.3

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance: W=0.750
Chi-square value=20.3, d.f.=9
Statistically significant beyond .05 level

Table 8. Socioeconomic characteristics of interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants in communities with population over 50,000

	Interstate migrants (n=287)	Intrastate migrants (n=312)	Nonmigrants (n=1,390)
		--percent--	
Age[a]			
18-24	9.9	18.2	10.2
25-44	47.3	55.7	31.8
45-64	24.7	19.2	38.1
65 and older	18.0	6.8	19.9
Sex			
Male	46.2	42.1	45.4
Female	53.8	57.9	54.6
Race[b]			
White	93.4	86.9	87.6
Black	1.7	7.4	7.6
Other	4.8	5.8	4.9
Marital Status[b]			
Never married	14.0	14.1	13.0
Married	76.9	74.7	71.1
Separated or divorced	4.5	9.0	8.8
Widowed	4.5	2.2	7.1
Education[a]			
Less than 12th grade	11.0	7.9	14.4
High school graduate	19.0	19.9	26.1
Some college	34.5	41.5	33.6
College graduate	15.5	17.7	13.3
Graduate or professional school	20.1	12.9	12.6
Employment status[a]			
Employed fulltime	45.5	62.7	50.1
Employed parttime	12.2	6.4	9.3
Unemployed	3.5	3.2	2.5
Student	3.8	4.2	3.1
Homemaker	14.7	15.1	16.9
Retired	18.9	6.8	15.6
Disabled	1.4	1.6	2.5
Occupation of houshold head[a]			
Professional, technical and managerial	43.0	42.8	33.5
Sales, clerical, craftsmen	21.9	28.8	29.2
Operatives, transportation, laborers, service workers	8.2	12.7	10.8
Not in labor force	26.9	15.7	26.5

Table 8. (Cont.)

	Interstate migrants (n=287)	Intrastate migrants (n=312)	Nonmigrants (n=1,390)
		--percent--	
Income			
Under $9,000	21.4	18.0	22.0
$9,000-14,999	25.9	22.8	24.1
$15,000-19,999	16.9	20.7	15.8
$20,000 and over	35.7	38.4	38.1
Number of children under 18			
0	62.0	56.3	63.2
1	16.5	19.9	16.0
2	13.4	16.4	13.1
3	6.7	5.5	5.6
4 or more	1.5	1.9	2.1
Residence[a]			
Own	63.2	61.8	77.0
Rent	28.8	26.9	12.1
Other	8.1	11.4	10.9
Presently registered to vote[a]	74.8	77.1	85.9
Voted in 1976 presidential election[a]	70.9	71.6	79.8

[a]Chi-square value statistically significant beyond .001 level of significance

[b]Chi-square value statistically significant beyond .01 level of significance

Table 9. Ranking of severity of specific problems by interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants in communities with populations over 50,000

Problem issue	Interstate migrants (n=287) Rank	Interstate migrants (n=287) Percent medium or serious	Intrastate migrants (n=312) Rank	Intrastate migrants (n=312) Percent medium or serious	Nonmigrants (n=1,390) Rank	Nonmigrants (n=1,390) Percent medium or serious
Teenage drug abuse	2	72.9	2	82.9	1	87.4
Job opportunities for youth	4	68.4	5	70.8	4	72.6
Crime	3	72.7	3	78.5	2	85.6
Traffic congestion	1	80.7	1	83.6	3	85.1
Availability of low-cost housing	7	57.4	6	68.5	6.5	65.7
Upkeep of roads and streets	10	50.7	9	62.1	9	60.0
Citizen participation in community decision making	9	52.7	8	62.6	8	62.5
Community growing too fast	6	60.4	7	66.4	6.5	65.7
Quality of junior high and high school programs	5	64.2	4	73.8	5	69.0
Safe paths for bike riders	8	55.0	10	59.7	10	59.1

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance: W=0.956
Chi-square value=25.8, d.f.=9
Statistically significant beyond .01 level

Table 10. Ranking of specific problem where more tax dollars should be spent by interstate migrants, intrastate migrants, and nonmigrants in communities with populations over 50,000

	Interstate migrants (n=287)		Intrastate migrants (n=312)		Nonmigrants (n=1,390)	
Problem issue	Rank	Percent spend more	Rank	Percent spend more	Rank	Percent spend more
Nursing care in the homes of older people	2	54.1	2	56.9	2	59.3
Special education programs for retarded and handicapped citizens	3	50.2	3	53.8	3	50.9
Preserving natural scenic areas	5	45.7	6	47.5	5	46.8
Housing for poor people	9	38.8	8	42.4	9	43.3
Crime prevention and control	1	65.2	1	66.6	1	68.8
Vocational training programs in high school	10	38.7	5	48.5	6	46.2
Improving existing streets and roads	7	43.2	7	43.0	7	45.3
Housing for older people	8	41.9	4	49.0	4	47.9
Building bike paths	6	44.4	10	38.4	8	44.6
Attracting and developing industry	4	46.0	9	42.9	10	42.9

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance: W=0.779
Chi-square value=21.1, d.f.=9
Statistically significant beyond .05 level